Se	Search Notes			

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/698,995	PARIKH ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Marianne I Padgett	1762	

	SEAR	CHED	
Class	Subclass	Date	Examiner
			-
181			-
_			<u> </u>

INT	ERFERENC	CE SEARCH	ED
Class	Subclass	Date	Examiner
		લ	

	SEARCH NOTES (INCLUDING SEARCH STRATEGY)		
	DATE	EXMR	
enquired concerning claim classification, see attached e-mails	12/17/2004	Mot,	
	1/12/2005		
	1/25/2005		
	1/26/2005		
spoke to Lynette Smith & Long Le about classification, the latter confirmed 435/5 for some products & kits; apparatus was	2/3/2005		
suggested for other kits & use of combination subcominationin restricting			
consulted with Shrive Beck on classification	2/3/2005	My	

attack to search Notes

Padgett, Marianne

From:

Chan, Christina

Sent:

Wednesday, January 12, 2005 1:44 PM

To:

Padgett, Marianne; Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Page,

Thurman; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew, Jeffrey; Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber,

Jon; Warden, Robert

Cc:

Ward, Edward

Subject:

RE: classification? - 10/698,995

Not 1644 subject matter. Ed Ward might be able to figure it out.

Chris Chan

TC 1600 New Hire Training Coordinator and SPE 1644

(571)-272-0841 Remsen, 3E89

----Original Message-----

From:

Padgett, Marianne

Sent:

Wednesday, January 12, 2005 11:05 AM

To:

Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Page, Thurman; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew, Jeffrey; Chan, Christina;

Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon; Warden, Robert

Subject:

FW: classification? - 10/698,995

Class 424 for lipid bilayers has been suggested to me & class 435 for possibly the kit/system claims & (436/?) possibly for some claims. Could you (or one of your examiners) please review claims relevant to your area & provide class/subclass so I can do a reasonable restriction (or accept transfer if you think the case is properly yours) or provide suggestions of where they might go/ who I should ask?

Thank you, Mimi Padgett (AU 1762,

ph# 2-1425)

-----Original Message-----

From:

Warden, Jill

Sent:

Monday, December 20, 2004 7:20 AM

To:

Padgett, Marianne

Cc:

Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael

Subject:

RE: classification? - 10/698,995

I am not sure where the lipid bilayer would go -- my guess would be 424.

With respect to the system for monitoring and environmental condition, because of the selective binding, I believe that would be in 435.

Chris or Long -- can you take a look at this case. There is a long list of toxins which will selectively bind to a modified lipid bilayer -- and most of the toxins are in 435 testing -- a couple are mine. I did not get into the specifics of the "slective" binding. If it is just chemical, I think the case should still go in 435, since most of the toxins are bacterial.

-----Original Message-----

From: Padgett, Marianne

Sent: Friday, December 17, 2004 9:42 AM

To: Warden, Jill

Subject: classification? - 10/698,995

Hi, I'm trying to figure out where these claims in 10/698,995 are classified for a restriction (or for transfer if there is a place outside generic coating (427) for the process claims).

They concern patterning lipid bilayers w/ UV & possibly contacting w/ more lipid bilayers:

process claims 1-17,19-40, 42-63, possibly mine -427/553; product claims 18,41,64,98-134,136-139 ???/???; & Kits or systems, claims 65-97, 130, 135,140 ???/???).

The only thing listed in the classification index for lipids is 436/71. While I didn't see any actual testing in the claims, p.1 discusses use in biological micro-arrays, so there's possibly some relation to 436/71, but its way outside my area, so could you or one of you examiners please let me know if any of these claims belong there or provide me some clue as to where they do belong?

Thank you,

Mimi Padgett (AU 1762).

From:

Ward, Edward

Sent:

Thursday, January 13, 2005 5:28 AM

To:

Padgett, Marianne

Subject:

RE: classification? - 10/698,995

If you restrict out the coating process, it may go to AU 1648, 435/5, since it is making an antibody/antigen test system for detecting a virus, among other things.

----Original Message----

From:

Padgett, Marianne

Sent:

Wednesday, January 12, 2005 2:34 PM

To:

Ward, Edward

Subject:

FW: classification? - 10/698,995

Importance: High

Mr. Ward, You were suggested as the possible solution to my where do these claims go problem by Mr. Page. Can you help please? Mimi Padgett (AU 1762)

----Original Message----

From:

Page, Thurman

Sent:

Wednesday, January 12, 2005 11:55 AM

To:

Padgett, Marianne; Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew, Jeffrey; Chan,

Christina; Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon; Warden, Robert

Subject:

RE: classification? - 10/698,995

Importance: High

I have reviewed the claims and it does not appear that there are any claims directed to my area -class 424/450 (liposomes and/or lipid bilayers). We require aliposome being used as a drug delivery device to a human for therapeutic value. Here the concept appears to be directed to detecting environmental pollution, contaminants, release of pathogenic agents, and harmful chemical agents.

I suggest you contact examiner Ed Ward who was our classifier. He could assist you in the classification of the claims. Process appears to involve a 264/4.1+ concept with the product per se a 428/402, 403+. Ed will be your best resource.

Thurman K. Page SPE, Art Unit 1615 **Technology Center 1600** 571-272-0602

-----Original Message-----

From:

Padgett, Marianne

Sent:

Wednesday, January 12, 2005 11:05 AM

To:

Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Page, Thurman; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew, Jeffrey; Chan, Christina;

Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon; Warden, Robert

Subject: FW: classification? - 10/698,995

Class 424 for lipid bilayers has been suggested to me & class 435 for possibly the kit/system claims & (436/?) possibly for some claims. Could you (or one of your examiners) please review claims relevant to your area & provide class/subclass so I can do a reasonable restriction (or accept transfer if you think the case is properly yours) or provide suggestions of where they might go/ who I should ask?

Thank you, Mimi Padgett (AU

1762, ph# 2-1425)

----Original Message-----Warden, Jill From:

Monday, December 20, 2004 7:20 AM Sent: To:

Padgett, Marianne

Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael

Subject: RE: classification? - 10/698,995

I am not sure where the lipid bilayer would go -- my guess would be 424.

With respect to the system for monitoring and environmental condition, because of the selective binding, I believe that would be in 435.

Chris or Long -- can you take a look at this case. There is a long list of toxins which will selectively bind to a modified lipid bilayer -- and most of the toxins are in 435 testing -- a couple are mine. I did not get into the specifics of the "slective" binding. If it is just chemical, I think the case should still go in 435, since most of the toxins are bacterial.

----Original Message----

From:

Padgett, Marianne

Sent:

Friday, December 17, 2004 9:42 AM

To: Warden, Jill

Subject:

classification? - 10/698,995

Hi, I'm trying to figure out where these claims in 10/698,995 are classified for a restriction (or for transfer if there is a place outside generic coating (427) for the process claims).

They concern patterning lipid bilayers w/ UV & possibly contacting w/ more lipid bilayers: process claims 1-17,19-40, 42-63, possibly mine -427/553; product claims 18,41,64,98-134,136-139 ???/???; &

Kits or systems, claims 65-97, 130, 135, 140, ???/???).

The only thing listed in the classification index for lipids is 436/71. While I didn't see any actual testing in the claims, p.1 discusses use in biological micro-arrays, so there's possibly some relation to 436/71, but its way outside my area, so could you or one of you examiners please let me know if any of these claims belong there or provide me some clue as to where they do belong?

From:

Shukla, Ram

Sent:

Wednesday, January 12, 2005 3:31 PM

To:

Warden, Robert; Padgett, Marianne; Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low,

Christopher; Page, Thurman; Kunz, Gary; Siew, Jeffrey; Chan, Christina; Smith, Lynette;

Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon

Subject:

RE: classification? - 10/698,995

This is not 1632 matter.

Ram Shukla

----Original Message----

From:

Warden, Robert

Sent:

Wednesday, January 12, 2005 1:41 PM

To:

Padgett, Marianne; Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Page, Thurman; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew,

Jeffrey; Chan, Christina; Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon

Subject:

RE: classification? - 10/698,995

I'll join Thurman in getting out of the way. We have the apparatus part of 435 and I don't see any claims that would fall into our area. The way 435 is set up the kit claims should go with the method not into the apparatus area. Good Luck.

----Original Message-----

From:

Padgett, Marianne

Sent:

Wednesday, January 12, 2005 11:05 AM

To:

Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Page, Thurman; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew, Jeffrey; Chan, Christina;

Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon; Warden, Robert

Subject: FW: classification? - 10/698,995

Class 424 for lipid bilayers has been suggested to me & class 435 for possibly the kit/system claims & (436/?) possibly for some claims. Could you (or one of your examiners) please review claims relevant to your area & provide class/subclass so I can do a reasonable restriction (or accept transfer if you think the case is properly yours) or provide suggestions of where they might go/ who I should ask?

Thank you, Mimi Padgett (AU

1762, ph# 2-1425)

----Original Message-----

From: \

: Warden, Jill

Sent: Monday, December 20, 2004 7:20 AM

To:

Padgett, Marianne

Cc: Chin

Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael

Subject: RE: classification? - 10/698,995

I am not sure where the lipid bilayer would go -- my guess would be 424.

With respect to the system for monitoring and environmental condition, because of the selective binding, I believe that would be in 435.

Chris or Long -- can you take a look at this case. There is a long list of toxins which will selectively bind to a modified lipid bilayer -- and most of the toxins are in 435 testing -- a couple are mine. I did not get into the specifics of the "slective" binding. If it is just chemical, I think the case should still go in 435, since most of the toxins are bacterial.

-----Original Message-----

From:

Padgett, Marianne

Sent:

Friday, December 17, 2004 9:42 AM

To: Warden, Jill

Subject:

classification? - 10/698,995

Hi, I'm trying to figure out where these claims in 10/698,995 are classified for a restriction (or for transfer if there is a place outside generic coating (427) for the process claims).

They concern patterning lipid bilayers w/ UV & possibly contacting w/ more lipid bilayers: process claims 1-17,19-40, 42-63, possibly mine -427/553; product claims 18,41,64,98-134,136-139 ???/???; & Kits or systems, claims 65-97, 130, 135,140 ???/???).

The only thing listed in the classification index for lipids is 436/71. While I didn't see any actual testing in the claims, p.1 discusses use in biological micro-arrays, so there's possibly some relation to 436/71, but its way outside my area, so could you or one of you examiners please let me know if any of these claims belong there or provide me some clue as to where they do belong?

From:

Seidleck, James

Sent:

Tuesday, January 25, 2005 1:45 PM

To:

Padgett, Marianne

Subject:

RE: classification? - 10/698,995

That sub requires a microcapsule to be formed. I don't think this coated bilayer is a microcapsule. I think this is TC1600 subject matter, even though they don't seem to think so.

----Original Message-----

From:

Padgett, Marianne

Sent:

Tuesday, January 25, 2005 12:56 PM

To:

Seidleck, James

Subject:

FW: classification? - 10/698,995

Importance: High

It was suggested to me that the process of patterning a lipid bilayer (clms 1-17, 19-40 & 42-63) might go in 264/4.1+. Are they related? I've never done a case on lipid bilayers, so I don't know if this is reasonable or not.

Thank you, Mimi Padgett (AU 1762, ph# 2-1425)

----Original Message-----

From:

Page, Thurman

Sent:

Wednesday, January 12, 2005 11:55 AM

To:

Padgett, Marianne; Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew, Jeffrey; Chan,

Christina; Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon; Warden, Robert

Subject:

RE: classification? - 10/698,995

Importance: High

I have reviewed the claims and it does not appear that there are any claims directed to my area -class 424/450 (liposomes and/or lipid bilayers). We require aliposome being used as a drug delivery device to a human for therapeutic value. Here the concept appears to be directed to detecting environmental pollution, contaminants, release of pathogenic agents, and harmful chemical agents.

I suggest you contact examiner Ed Ward who was our classifier. He could assist you in the classification of the claims. Process appears to involve a 264/4.1+ concept with the product per se a 428/402, 403+. Ed will be your best resource.

Thurman K. Page SPE, Art Unit 1615 **Technology Center 1600** 571-272-0602

----Original Message----

Padgett, Marianne

Sent:

Wednesday, January 12, 2005 11:05 AM

Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Page, Thurman; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew, Jeffrey; Chan, Christina;

Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon; Warden, Robert

Subject: FW: classification? - 10/698,995

Class 424 for lipid bilayers has been suggested to me & class 435 for possibly the kit/system claims & (436/?) possibly for some claims. Could you (or one of your examiners) please review claims relevant to your area & provide class/subclass so I can do a reasonable restriction (or accept transfer if you think the case is properly yours) or provide suggestions of where they might go/ who I should ask?

Thank you, Mimi Padgett (AU

1762, ph# 2-1425)

----Original Message-----

From: Warden, Jill

Monday, December 20, 2004 7:20 AM Sent: Padgett, Marianne To:

Cc:

Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael

Subject: RE: classification? - 10/698,995

I am not sure where the lipid bilayer would go -- my guess would be 424.

With respect to the system for monitoring and environmental condition, because of the selective binding, I believe that would be in 435.

Chris or Long -- can you take a look at this case. There is a long list of toxins which will selectively bind to a modified lipid bilayer -- and most of the toxins are in 435 testing -- a couple are mine. I did not get into the specifics of the "slective" binding. If it is just chemical, I think the case should still go in 435, since most of the toxins are bacterial.

-----Original Message-----

From: Padgett, Marianne

Sent: Friday, December 17, 2004 9:42 AM

To: Warden, Jill

Subject: classification? - 10/698,995

Hi, I'm trying to figure out where these claims in 10/698,995 are classified for a restriction (or for transfer if there is a place outside generic coating (427) for the process claims).

They concern patterning lipid bilayers w/ UV & possibly contacting w/ more lipid bilayers: process claims 1-17,19-40, 42-63, possibly mine -427/553; product claims 18,41,64,98-134,136-139 ???/???; &

Kits or systems, claims 65-97, 130, 135, 140, ???/???).

The only thing listed in the classification index for lipids is 436/71. While I didn't see any actual testing in the claims, p.1 discusses use in biological micro-arrays, so there's possibly some relation to 436/71, but its way outside my area, so could you or one of you examiners please let me know if any of these claims belong there or provide me some clue as to where they do belong?

From:

Padgett, Marianne

Sent:

Wednesday, January 26, 2005 9:22 AM

To: Subject: Housel, James; Smith, Lynette FW: classification? - 10/698,995 No response

AU 1648 &/or 435/5 have been suggested to me for some of the claims of this case. Do you agree with this for any of the claims? If so which ones & what would you suggest is the appropriate classification for the others? you, Mimi Padgett (AU 1762; REM 8D71; 2-1425)

-----Original Message-----

From:

Ward, Edward

Padgett, Marianne

Sent:

Thursday, January 13, 2005 5:28 AM

To:

Subject:

RE: classification? - 10/698,995

If you restrict out the coating process, it may go to AU 1648, 435/5, since it is making an antibody/antigen test system for detecting a virus, among other things.

-----Original Message-----

From:

Padgett, Marianne

Sent:

Wednesday, January 12, 2005 2:34 PM

To:

Ward, Edward

Subject: FW: classification? - 10/698,995

Importance: High

Mr. Ward, You were suggested as the possible solution to my where do these claims go problem by Mr. Page. Can Mimi Padgett (AU 1762) you help please?

----Original Message-----

From:

Page, Thurman

Sent:

Wednesday, January 12, 2005 11:55 AM

To:

Padgett, Marianne; Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew, Jeffrey; Chan,

Christina; Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon; Warden, Robert

Subject: RE: classification? - 10/698,995

Importance: High

I have reviewed the claims and it does not appear that there are any claims directed to my area -class 424/450 (liposomes and/or lipid bilayers). We require aliposome being used as a drug delivery device to a human for therapeutic value. Here the concept appears to be directed to detecting environmental pollution, contaminants, release of pathogenic agents, and harmful chemical agents.

I suggest you contact examiner Ed Ward who was our classifier. He could assist you in the classification of the claims. Process appears to involve a 264/4.1+ concept with the product per se a 428/402, 403+. Ed will be your best resource.

Thurman K. Page SPE, Art Unit 1615 Technology Center 1600 571-272-0602

-----Original Message-----

Padgett, Marianne From:

Wednesday, January 12, 2005 11:05 AM Sent:

Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Page, Thurman; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew, Jeffrey; Chan, Christina; To:

Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon; Warden, Robert

Subject: FW: classification? - 10/698,995

Class 424 for lipid bilayers has been suggested to me & class 435 for possibly the kit/system claims & (436/?) possibly for some claims. Could you (or one of your examiners) please review claims relevant to your area & provide class/subclass so I can do a reasonable restriction (or accept transfer if you think the case is properly yours) or provide suggestions of where they might go/ who I should ask?

1762, ph# 2-1425)

----Original Message----From: Warden, Jill

Sent: Monday, December 20, 2004 7:20 AM

To: Padgett, Marianne

Cc: Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael

Subject: RE: classification? - 10/698,995

I am not sure where the lipid bilayer would go -- my guess would be 424.

With respect to the system for monitoring and environmental condition, because of the selective binding, I believe that would be in 435.

Chris or Long -- can you take a look at this case. There is a long list of toxins which will selectively bind to a modified lipid bilayer -- and most of the toxins are in 435 testing -- a couple are mine. I did not get into the specifics of the "slective" binding. If it is just chemical, I think the case should still go in 435, since most of the toxins are bacterial.

----Original Message-----

From: Padgett, Marianne

Sent: Friday, December 17, 2004 9:42 AM

To: Warden, Jill

Subject: classification? - 10/698,995

Hi, I'm trying to figure out where these claims in 10/698,995 are classified for a restriction (or for transfer if there is a place outside generic coating (427) for the process claims).

They concern patterning lipid bilayers w/ UV & possibly contacting w/ more lipid bilayers: process claims 1-17,19-40, 42-63, possibly mine -427/553; product claims 18,41,64,98-134,136-139 ???/???; & Kits or systems, claims 65-97, 130, 135,140 ???/???).

The only thing listed in the classification index for lipids is 436/71. While I didn't see any actual testing in the claims, p.1 discusses use in biological micro-arrays, so there's possibly some relation to 436/71, but its way outside my area, so could you or one of you examiners please let me know if any of these claims belong there or provide me some clue as to where they do belong?

From:

Padgett, Marianne

Sent:

Wednesday, January 26, 2005 9:47 AM

To:

Nakarani, Dhirajlal

Subject:

FW: classification? - 10/698,995

No response

It was suggested to me by Mr. Page that the product having a lipid bilayer (claims 18, 41, 64, 98-134, 136-139) might go in 428/402 or 403+, but given Mr. Seidleck's comments, I have my doughts. Do you know of any appropriate 428 subclasses or can you suggest any appropriate class or art unit?

Thank you, Mimi

Padgett (AU 1762, REM 8D71, ph# 2-1425)

----Original Message-----

From:

Seidleck, James

Sent: To: Tuesday, January 25, 2005 1:45 PM

10:

Padgett, Marianne

Subject:

RE: classification? - 10/698,995

That sub requires a microcapsule to be formed. I don't think this coated bilayer is a microcapsule. I think this is TC1600 subject matter, even though they don't seem to think so.

----Original Message----

From:

Padgett, Marianne

Sent:

Tuesday, January 25, 2005 12:56 PM

To:

Seidleck, James

Subject:

FW: classification? - 10/698,995

Importance: High

It was suggested to me that the process of patterning a lipid bilayer (clms 1-17, 19-40 & 42-63) might go in 264/4.1+. Are they related? I've never done a case on lipid bilayers, so I don't know if this is reasonable or not.

Thank you, Mimi Padgett (AU 1762, ph# 2-1425)

----Original Message-----

From:

Page, Thurman

Sent:

Wednesday, January 12, 2005 11:55 AM

To:

Padgett, Marianne; Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew, Jeffrey; Chan,

Christina; Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon; Warden, Robert

Subject:

RE: classification? - 10/698,995

Importance: High

I have reviewed the claims and it does not appear that there are any claims directed to my area -class 424/450 (liposomes and/or lipid bilayers). We require aliposome being used as a drug delivery device to a human for therapeutic value. Here the concept appears to be directed to detecting environmental pollution, contaminants, release of pathogenic agents, and harmful chemical agents.

I suggest you contact examiner Ed Ward who was our classifier. He could assist you in the classification of the claims. Process appears to involve a 264/4.1+ concept with the product per se a 428/402, 403+. Ed will be your best resource.

Thurman K. Page SPE, Art Unit 1615 Technology Center 1600 571-272-0602

> -----Original Message-----From: Padgett, Marianne

Sent: Wednesday, January 12, 2005 11:05 AM

To: Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael; Low, Christopher; Page, Thurman; Kunz, Gary; Shukla, Ram; Siew, Jeffrey; Chan, Christina;

Smith, Lynette; Caputa, Anthony; Weber, Jon; Warden, Robert

Subject: FW: classification? - 10/698,995

Class 424 for lipid bilayers has been suggested to me & class 435 for possibly the kit/system claims & (436/?) possibly for some claims. Could you (or one of your examiners) please review claims relevant to your area & provide class/subclass so I can do a reasonable restriction (or accept transfer if you think the case is properly yours) or provide suggestions of where they might go/ who I should ask?

Thank you, Mimi Padgett (AU

1762, ph# 2-1425)

----Original Message-----From: Warden, Jill

Sent: Monday, December 20, 2004 7:20 AM

To: Padgett, Marianne

Cc: Chin, Chris; Le, Long; Wityshyn, Michael

Subject: RE: classification? - 10/698,995

I am not sure where the lipid bilayer would go -- my guess would be 424.

With respect to the system for monitoring and environmental condition, because of the selective binding, I believe that would be in 435.

Chris or Long -- can you take a look at this case. There is a long list of toxins which will selectively bind to a modified lipid bilayer -- and most of the toxins are in 435 testing -- a couple are mine. I did not get into the specifics of the "slective" binding. If it is just chemical, I think the case should still go in 435, since most of the toxins are bacterial.

----Original Message-----

From: Padgett, Marianne

Sent: Friday, December 17, 2004 9:42 AM

To: Warden, Jill

Subject: classification? - 10/698,995

Hi, I'm trying to figure out where these claims in 10/698,995 are classified for a restriction (or for transfer if there is a place outside generic coating (427) for the process claims).

They concern patterning lipid bilayers w/ UV & possibly contacting w/ more lipid bilayers:

process claims 1-17,19-40, 42-63, possibly mine -427/553;

product claims 18,41,64,98-134,136-139 ???/???; &

Kits or systems, claims 65-97, 130, 135, 140, ???/???).

The only thing listed in the classification index for lipids is 436/71. While I didn't see any actual testing in the claims, p.1 discusses use in biological micro-arrays, so there's possibly some relation to 436/71, but its way outside my area, so could you or one of you examiners please let me know if any of these claims belong there or provide me some clue as to where they do belong?